



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,777	11/10/2003	Cedomila Ristic-Lehmann	FA/263	7870
28596	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
GORE ENTERPRISE HOLDINGS, INC. 551 PAPER MILL ROAD P. O. BOX 9206 NEWARK, DE 19714-9206			HU, HENRY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,777	RISTIC-LEHMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry S. Hu	1713	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Henry S. Hu. (3) _____.

(2) Dianne Burkhard. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 December 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Several products made from aerogel/PTFE blend are presented.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

H.S.H.
12-21-05

D.W.W.

DAVID W. WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 1700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Several issues raised on Final rejection of October 28, 2005 and interview summary of December 2, 2005 are discussed in detail. All arguments are still on the aerogel material made by Stepanian. The Examiner has again pointed out Stepanian may have used aerogel in both two forms including powder and monolith so as to make a conclusion with comparison result in paragraphs 0010 and 0011. However, the Attorney has pointed out that batting as reinforcing phase is required in making Stepanian's aerogel composite materials (see paragraphs 0026 and 0039-0041). In the preparation for filing RCE, the Attorney proposes to further amend parent Claim 1 by at least including weight % limitation from Claims 5-7 as well as the particle size of Claim 10 for PTFE binder. Other than checking Stepanian, the Examiner points out a new search is clearly needed to be sure that no other prior art is existed for 102 and/or 103 rejections. During the interview, several products made from the aerogel material of Claim 1 are presented; the support for "putty" form for aerogel/PTFE blend is also presented.

HHS
12-21-05